Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 4, 2007.

Claims 1-51 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-51. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

Claims 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone et al., United States Patent No.: 6,804,686, filed on September 10, 2002.

Claims 1, 11, 21, 31 and 40-42 read as follows:

Claim 1:   A computer-based system for a distributed web application wherein said framework is capable of accepting a communication, comprising:

a controller operable to accept the communication and provide the communication to a model;

the model operable to perform processing of the request and to determine a web page to be rendered;

the page operable to provide a response based on the request; and

wherein the web page belongs to a web page group.

Claim 11:   A system for a distributed application wherein said framework is capable of accepting a communication, comprising:

a controller operable to accept the communication and provide the communication to a model;

the model operable to perform processing of the request and to determine a web page to be rendered;

the web page operable to provide a response based on the request;

wherein the web page can be the target of an action method; and

wherein the web page can raise an action method.

Claim 21:   A method for accepting a communication, comprising:

providing the communication to a controller;

associating a model with said communication;

determining a state of the model based on said communication;

providing a view based on the state of the model; and

wherein the view is a web page in a web page group.

Claim 31:   A method for accepting a communication, comprising:

providing the communication to a controller;

associating a model with said communication;

determining a state of the model based on said communication;

providing a view based on the state of the model;

wherein the view is a web page in a page group;

wherein the web page can be the target of an action method; and

wherein the web page can raise an action method.

Claim 40:   A system comprising:

a means for providing a communication to a controller;

a means for associating a model with said communication;

a means for determining a state of the model based on said communication;

a means for providing a view based on the state of the model; and

wherein the view is a web page in a web page group.

Claim 41:   A computer data signal embodied in a transmission medium, comprising:

a code segment including instructions to provide a communication to a controller;

a code segment including instructions to associate a model with said communication;

a code segment including instructions to determine a state of the model based on said communication;

a code segment including instructions to provide a view based on the state of the model; and

wherein the view is a web page in a web page group.

Claim 42: A machine readable medium having instructions stored thereon that when executed by a processor cause a system to:

provide a communication to a controller;

associate a model with said communication;

determine a state of the model based on said communication;

provide a view based on the state of the model; and

wherein the view is a page in a page group.

The applicant asserts that it would not have been obvious to extend the UML system of Stone to produce a web page system as claimed.

In column 18, lines 41-46, Stone does describe Java server pages (JSPs) being mapped by UML. But this is not evidence that one skilled in the art would modify Stone in the manner suggested by the examiner. In Stone, UML is constructed that illustrates the relationships of JSPs. Someone skilled in the art reading Stone would not think to modify Stone to create JSP pages rather than just analyze JSP pages.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted

Date: June 27, 2007   By: /Joseph P. O'Malley/
                                 Joseph P. O'Malley
                                 Reg. No. 36,226

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800